

Remarks:

Claims 7-36 and 45-46 are pending in this application. Claims 1-6 and 37-44 have been canceled. Claims 45-46 are newly added.


Turning now to the office action, the examiner raised numerous rejections to polymer claims 1-6. These claims have been canceled so any rejections against claims 1-6 are now moot.

Next, the examiner rejected a number of the claims as being anticipated by the Puligadda et al. reference (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0004283). Thus, the applicant is filing herewith a declaration under 37 C.F.R. §1.131 by Shreeram Deshpande, the inventor named on this application. This declaration is currently unsigned due to the unavailability of Mr. Deshpande. However, a signed copy will be provided shortly.

This declaration is being submitted to establish actual reduction to practice of the claimed invention prior to the June 5, 2001, the filing date of the Puligadda et al. reference. Paragraph 2 of the declaration explains how the material from Exhibit A (photocopies of lab notebook pages) relates to the pending claims. It is respectfully submitted that all rejections based upon the Puligadda et al. reference should be withdrawn in light of this declaration.

The examiner also raised a number of rejections against the independent claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,495,305 to Enomoto et al. The only pending independent claims which were the subject of an anticipation rejection based upon the

Enomoto et al. patent are claims 7, 18, and 27. Each of these claims requires the presence of a polymer comprising recurring monomers according to the formula




wherein:

each R is individually selected from the group consisting of -OH, -H, and alkyl groups; and X is an aromatic or heterocyclic light-absorbing moiety and if none of R is -OH, then X includes an -OH.

Upon studying the examiner's comments in paragraph 7 of the office action, the examiner has provided the structure found in claim 8 of the Enomoto et al. patent (supplementing it with the specific X' groups of claim 9 which depends from claim 8) to make this rejection (see the top of page 6 of the office action).

The applicant's submit that this structure is different than the claimed structure as set forth above. Neither monomer in the Enomoto structure exactly matches the structure of the applicant's claims. Referring to the atoms immediately adjacent the X group of the claimed structure and

comparing them to the atoms immediately adjacent the X' group of the Enomoto et al. patent, it can be seen that the Enomoto et al. structure is lacking the group



As a result, an anticipation rejection is improper in this situation.

Furthermore, such a modification of the polymer in the Enomoto et al. patent would not have been obvious at the time of invention as there is no teaching or suggestion in the art to make this change. The presence of the -C(O)O- portion in the claimed polymer allows for a broader range of chromophores to be used as X. This, in turn, allows the etch properties of the composition to be adjusted as needed (e.g., to accommodate the properties of the particular photoresist being utilized). This provides the significant advantage of an anti-reflective coating composition whose etch properties and light-absorbing abilities can be fine-tuned or customized as needed for the particular circumstances, process conditions, etc. without the need to change the polymer backbone. It is, therefore, respectfully submitted that independent claims 7, 18, and 27 (and all claims depending therefrom) are patentable over the Enomoto et al. patent.

The only remaining rejection not addressed above is that to claim 37 in light of U.S. Patent No. 6,110,653 to Holmes et al. Claim 37 has been canceled so this rejection is now moot.


It is noted with appreciation that the examiner found claim 38 to be allowable over the art. Thus, claim 38 has been rewritten in independent format and is presented as claim 45. Furthermore,

it is noted the examiner did not raise any rejections against claim 44. Thus, this claim has been rewritten in independent format as claim 46. Finally, the examiner did not raise any rejections against claims 9, 20, and 34 so it is assumed that these claims have been found to be allowable over the art as well.

It is believed that each of the issues raised by the examiner has been addressed above, and that no further issues remain. Thus, the applicant respectfully submits the pending claims are in condition for allowance. In the event of further questions, the examiner is urged to call the undersigned. Any additional fee which might be due in connection with this application should be applied against our Deposit Account No. 19-0522.

Respectfully submitted,

By

  
Tracy Bornman, Reg. No. 42,347  
HOVEY WILLIAMS LLP  
2405 Grand Boulevard, Suite 400  
Kansas City, Missouri 64108  
816/474-9050

ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANT